



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Le Mystère d'Adam: An Anglo-Norman Drama of the Twelfth Century.

Edited by PAUL STUDER. Modern Language Texts, L. E. Kastner, general editor. Manchester (England): University Press, 1918. Pp. lviii+80.

The remarkable impulse which has been given lately to the study of "moderns" in England is revealed by the epoch-making government report on modern languages (republished recently under the title *Modern Studies*); by the foundation of the Modern Language Research Association, whose fourth *Bulletin* has just been issued, and by the appearance of texts like the present one, emanating from Oxford and intended for the use of students in the English-speaking universities. If all the new texts are to be as well chosen and as well edited as this one, or as Orr's *Guiot de Provins* (*Modern Philology*, XVI, 391), the promoters of the movement may be assured that they are making enviable progress and in the right direction.

The *Representacio Ade* is peculiarly well suited to classroom use: were it not that the unique manuscript is very poor, besides being incomplete, the play would be ideal for the purpose. Mr. Studer has, however, done extremely well in getting at, or toward, what must have been the original; he has preserved most of what was valuable in the older editions of Luzarche and Grass, and he has incorporated all the useful comments of G. Paris, Foerster, and Tobler. The Introduction deals with the sources of the play, with its staging, and with the language and versification of the author and of the manuscript as it stands. The whole has been printed with commendable care.

A few comments may be offered. Line 63, the emendation seems awkward and unnecessary: change *petit* to *poi* and cf. *Erec* 3416. Line 114, the *estas* of the MS has better claims than the substituted *estes*. 172 *tei membrera*. Line 185, the Devil is seeking to make Adam discontented in Eden, where he is but a gardener:

Deus t'a fait gardein de son ort,
Ja ne querras altre deport ?

The next line, *Forma il tei por ventre faire*, has always seemed to the writer wretchedly out of keeping, as well as poor in argument: possibly *ventre* has replaced some rarer word unfamiliar to the copyist. It might repay research to examine the Romance forms from Lat. *vēllēre*, which came to mean 'binding,' 'edging,' 'border,' and hence might have been applied to

garden borders; cf. the Picard *viaure* (*ML*, II, §§ 10, 54) and LaCurne's *velte* (read *velre*?); the *ueure* of *Aspremont* 25ab may not be the same word. "Did the Lord shape you only to be a maker of (paths and) borders?" Line 290, Why has the possibility of reading *s'oposer* or *sei oposer* (MS *soposer*) been rejected? Line 345-46, it does not seem at all certain that rhymes such as *dreit: plait*, found in the MS, are to be thrown out; cf. *Modern Philology*, X, 448. Line 388, the non-elision *ta ire* being frankly impossible, one might read: *Repost me sui la [enz] por t'ire, la enz* representing *in angulo paradisi* above. Line 420, a simpler change, the omission of *que*, would allow the MS reading to stand. Nothing is commoner in the rejuvenation of language by copyists than this suppression of the older paratactic construction; one instance is *Roland* 359, and the same MS would furnish half a dozen others. Shepard's excellent article *PMLA*, XXI, 519, on parataxis in Provençal, might be of use here. Line 482, further search might show that *ras* 'head' existed in Provençal; at any rate, *escachier* 'bruise,' 'crush,' is just the right verb here; cf. Villon, *Testament* 1202. Line 678, a *grant relais* might be translated 'at considerable distance between,' instead of 'very leisurely.' Line 732, *Ço sai jo bien*. Line 847, this troublesome line might be repaired by reading *oi* for the MS *ai*: *oïr merveille* is very frequent in OF and fits here admirably. Line 886, Grass's punctuation was the better, for *Trovas le tu* means not 'Did you find it?' but 'Did you invent it?'

T. A. JENKINS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra: Rinconete y Cortadillo. Translated from the Spanish with an Introduction and Notes. By MARIANO J. LORENTE, with a preface by R. B. CUNNINGHAME GRAHAM. Boston: The Four Seas Co., 1917.

Mr. Lorente's translation of *Rinconete y Cortadillo* is by far the best yet made. While there is room for improvement, the translation gives evidence of much careful and sympathetic work. It would have been well had Mr. Lorente bestowed the same care upon the Introduction. His decidedly flippant attitude and his careless contradiction of greater scholars than he, often without convincing proofs, are offensive in the extreme.

In the first few pages Mr. Lorente gives his reasons for making the translation and assures us of the great need of such a work. All preceding translations, we are told, are worthless. Norman McColl's alone has the merit of having been made from the *editio princeps*. If we are to believe Mr. Lorente, McColl made poor use of it. There is much merriment at the expense of Fitzmaurice Kelly, who praised the translation extravagantly.